

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s):	§	
Josh Judd	§	Customer No.: 29855
	§	
Serial No.: 10/699,603	§	
	§	Art Unit: 2616
Filed: October 31, 2003	§	
	§	Examiner: Mohammad Sajid Adhami
For: NETWORK PATH TRACING	§	
METHOD FOR MULTI-LEVEL	§	
SWITCHES	§	Docket No. 112-0139US

Box Appeal Brief
Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Mail Stop: Appeal Briefs – Patents

APPEAL BRIEF

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST	3
II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES	4
III. STATUS OF CLAIMS	5
IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS	6
V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER.....	7
VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL	10
VII. ARGUMENT.....	11
A. Section 103 Rejection Perlman in view of Shah.....	11
1. Claims 1, 19, 37 and 55	11
2. Claims 11, 29, 47 and 65	13
3. Claims 12, 30, 48 and 66	14
4. Claims 13, 31, 49 and 67	15
B. Section 103 Rejection Perlman in view of Shah and Fredericks	15
1. Claims 14, 32, 50 and 68	15
C. Section 103 Rejection Perlman in view of Shah and Lee	17
1. Claims 15, 33, 51 and 69	17
D. CONCLUSION.....	17
VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX.....	18
IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX.....	29
X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX.....	30

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

Brocade Communications Systems, Inc. is the real party in interest

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

None of which Applicant is aware.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-72 are rejected. The appealed claims are 1-72.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

As the Office Action is not final, there are no amendments after final.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

This section provides a concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims involved in the appeal, referring to the specification by paragraph and line number and to the drawings by reference characters as required by 37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(v). Each element of the claims is identified with a corresponding reference to the specification and drawings where applicable. Note that the citation to passages in the specification and drawings for each claim element does not imply that the limitations from the specification and drawings should be read into the corresponding claim element.

Independent claim 1 recites a switch (Fig. 7, switch 700; ¶ 0053) for use in a fabric (Fig. 1, fabric 210; ¶ 0015), the switch comprising:

a plurality of ports (Fig. 7; Fig. 2A, ports 22, 24, 26, 28; ¶¶ 0019, 0053)
configured to receive and transmit a frame;

a fabric manager (Fig. 2A, fabric manager 38; ¶¶ 0018, 0022) coupled to the plurality of ports to obtain the received frame and to provide a frame to be transmitted, the fabric manager configured to add information (Fig. 6, steps 628, 622, 626; ¶¶ 0034, 0040, 0047); and

a plurality of interconnected switching units (Fig. 7, edge switching units 702, 704, core switching unit 706; ¶ 0053) coupled to the plurality of ports so that a frame may traverse multiple switching units in the switch,

wherein the fabric manager is configured to add information to the frame, the information including receive and transmit port identity (¶ 0034), the switch identity (¶ 0034) and information about each of the plurality of switching units and interconnections (¶ 0054) when a frame traverses multiple switching units and to provide the frame for transmission.

Independent claim 19 recites a fabric (Fig. 1, fabric 210; ¶ 0015) comprising:

a first switch (Fig. 1, switches 221, 223, 225, 227, 229, 231; Fig. 2A, switch 20; Fig. 7, switch 700; ¶¶ 0015, 0018, 0053); and

a second switch (Fig. 1, switches 221, 223, 225, 227, 229, 231; Fig. 2A, switch 20; Fig. 7, switch 700; ¶¶ 0015, 0018, 0053) coupled to the first switch,

wherein each of the first and second switches includes:

a plurality of ports (Fig. 7; Fig. 2A, ports 22, 24, 26, 28; ¶¶ 0019, 0053)
configured to receive and transmit a frame; and

a fabric manager (Fig. 2A, fabric manager 38; ¶¶ 0018, 0022) coupled to the
plurality of ports to obtain the received frame and to provide a frame to be transmitted, the fabric
manager configured to add information to the frame (Fig. 6, steps 628, 622, 626; ¶¶ 0034, 0040,
0047), the information including receive and transmit port identity (¶ 0034) and the switch
identity (¶ 0034), and to provide the frame for transmission, and

wherein at least one of the first and second switches further includes:

a plurality of interconnected switching units (Fig. 7, edge switching units 702,
704, core switching unit 706; ¶ 0053) coupled to the plurality of ports so that a frame may
traverse multiple switching units in the switch,

wherein the fabric manager of the switch is configured to add information about
each of the plurality of switching units and interconnections (¶ 0054) when a frame traverses
multiple switching units.

Independent claim 37 recites a network comprising:

a first node device (Fig. 1, computer system 250; ¶ 0015);

a second node device (Fig. 1, storage device 290; ¶ 0015); and

a fabric (Fig. 1, fabric 210; ¶ 0015) connected to the first and second node devices,
wherein the fabric includes:

a first switch (Fig. 1, switches 221, 223, 225, 227, 229, 231; Fig. 2A, switch 20;
Fig. 7, switch 700; ¶¶ 0015, 0018, 0053); and

a second switch (Fig. 1, switches 221, 223, 225, 227, 229, 231; Fig. 2A, switch
20; Fig. 7, switch 700; ¶¶ 0015, 0018, 0053) coupled to the first switch,

wherein each of the first and second switches includes:

a plurality of ports (Fig. 7; Fig. 2A, ports 22, 24, 26, 28; ¶¶ 0019, 0053)
configured to receive and transmit a frame; and

a fabric manager (Fig. 2A, fabric manager 38; ¶¶ 0018, 0022) coupled to
the plurality of ports to obtain the received frame and to provide a frame to be transmitted, the

fabric manager configured to add information to the frame (Fig. 6, steps 628, 622, 626; ¶¶ 0034, 0040, 0047), the information including receive and transmit port identity (¶ 0034) and the switch identity (¶ 0034), and to provide the frame for transmission, and

wherein at least one of the first and second switches further includes:

a plurality of interconnected switching units (Fig. 7, edge switching units 702, 704, core switching unit 706; ¶ 0053) coupled to the plurality of ports so that a frame may traverse multiple switching units in the switch,

wherein the fabric manager of the switch is configured to add information about each of the plurality of switching units and interconnections (¶ 0054) when a frame traverses multiple switching units.

Independent claim 55 recites a method of providing frame routing information through a switch (Fig. 7, switch 700; ¶ 0053) having a plurality of ports (Fig. 7; Fig. 2A, ports 22, 24, 26, 28; ¶¶ 0019, 0053) and a plurality of interconnected switching units (Fig. 7, edge switching units 702, 704, core switching unit 706; ¶ 0053) coupled to the plurality of ports so that a frame may traverse multiple switching units in the switch, the method comprising:

receiving a frame;

adding information to the frame (Fig. 6, steps 628, 622, 626; ¶¶ 0034, 0040, 0047), the information including receive and transmit port identity (¶ 0034), the switch identity (¶ 0034) and information about each of the plurality of switching units and interconnections (¶ 0054) when a frame traverses multiple switching units; and

providing the frame to a port for transmission.

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Claims 1, 8-13, 18, 19, 26-31, 36, 37, 44-49, 54, 55, 62-67 and 72 were rejected under § 103 over Perlman (U.S. Patent No. 5,844,902) in view of Shah (U.S. Patent No. 7,111,105). Claims 2-7, 20-25, 38-43 and 56-61 were rejected under § 103 over Perlman in view of Shah and further in view of Soumiya (U.S. Patent No. 6,671,257). Claims 14, 16, 32, 34, 50, 52, 68 and 70 were rejected under § 103 over Perlman in view of Shah and further in view of Fredericks (U.S. Patent No. 6,347,334). Claims 15, 33, 51 and 69 were rejected under § 103 over Perlman in view of Shah and further in view of Lee (U. S. Patent Application No. 2003/0099194). Claims 17, 35, 53 and 71 were rejected under § 103 over Perlman in view of Shah and further in view of Hongal (U. S. Patent Application No. 2005/0053006).

VII. ARGUMENT

The claims do not stand or fall together. Instead, appellants present separate arguments for various independent and dependent claims. After a concise discussion of cited art, each of these arguments is separately argued below and presented with separate headings and sub-heading as required by 37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(vii).

A. Section 103 Rejection Perlman in view of Shah

1. Claims 1, 19, 37 and 55

The claims all require a switch which includes a plurality of interconnected switching units coupled to the ports. The Office Action asserts that I/O node 601 is a switch that contains multiple switching units. Applicant vigorously traverses this statement.

Shah deals with bus-bridges and bridge-bridges. Other than a passing reference to switch fabric 620, Shah does not discuss switches. Shah states at col. 8, lines 38-49:

FIG. 4 shows the disclosed embodiment of FIG. 2 incorporated into a computer system 600. The computer system 600 includes CPU nodes 610, I/O nodes 630, and switch matrix 620. CPU nodes 610 include the four nodes 611, 612, 613 and 614. I/O nodes 630 include four I/O nodes 601, 602, 603 and 604. A switch fabric 620 is connected to CPU nodes 610 and to I/O nodes 630. The embodiment disclose in FIG. 2 is shown in FIG. 4 as I/O node 0. Like FIG. 2, I/O node 0 contains a parent-bridge 230. Parent-bridge 230 is attached via child-links 285 to child-bridges 260. The child-bridges 260, in turn, are connected via grand-child links 295 to buses 280. Finally, buses 280 are attached to I/O devices 290. It is

Thus Fig. 2 is the detailed description of the I/O node 601 used in the Office Action. At col. 3, lines 65-66 Shah states: “Fig. 2 illustrates a typical multi-bridge architecture 400 implemented according to the disclosed techniques.” Fig. 2 shows I/O devices connected via buses to various bus-bridges which in turn are connected via buses to a bridge-bridge, in the language of Shah. Thus Shah does not teach or suggest “a plurality of switching units coupled to the ports so that a frame traverses multiple switching units in the switch.” Rather, Shah teaches a multi-level

bus-bridge arrangement, which is not similar or analogous to a multi-tier switch as specified in the claims.

Additionally, one skilled in the art would not combine Perlman and Shah. Perlman relates to network switching, particularly to traversing numerous LANs using network bridges. Shah relates to bus-level communications with I/O devices using parallel buses, not network links, and multiple levels of bus-bridges. The two teachings simply are unrelated and could not be combined to form a switch, particularly as Shah does not relate to switches. Perlman is for connecting networks. Shah is for connecting end I/O devices using buses. Shah only relates to end point operations while Perlman relates to entirely intermediary operations. The two teachings are not compatible.

The statement in the Office Action that Shah pertains to network communications is flawed. Fig. 4 of Shah, by its own words, only describes a computer system, not a network. The stated reason for combination in the Office Action to provide central control and connect network devices to a network is also flawed. Perlman already connects network devices to a network and further connects networks. As to the central control point, this does not appear to be taught by Shah and actually is opposed to Perlman and the present claims and their fundamental independent nature.

Further, when the combination with Perlman is considered, the improperly proposed use of the Shah bus-bridges would not include information about each of the interconnected switching units, at least because there are no switching units other than the element 620 described only as a switching fabric with no further details. Perlman teaches adding information to the explorer messages for each bridge connecting two network rings. If, contrary to the teachings of Shah and in gross hindsight, the I/O devices of Shah were somehow replaced, with no suggestion in the references, with network ports, the three bus-bridges of Shah would collapse to be a single bridge in Perlman, which would then only identify the bridge between the WAN 24 and the user 40. Thus no internal switching unit information would be provided or necessary, as such information would not be needed to perform the source routing of Perlman. The only time Perlman would add information about each bus-bridge of Shah is if the bus-bridges were independent, but then the required included plurality of interconnected switching units would not be present.

Applicant submits that the proposed combination of Shah is improper and, if performed, still does not teach the requirements of claims 1, 19, 37 and 55. Applicant therefore requests reversal of the rejection and allowance of all claims.

2. Claims 11, 29, 47 and 65

Claims 11, 29, 47 and 65 require the fabric manager to select the port to transmit the tracer frame based on normal routing rules. The Office Action cites col. 3, lines 31-33 and 54-55 and col. 5, lines 56-64 in rejecting the claims. Applicant traverses the rejection. The first cited portions of Perlman relate to ordinary messages. Those normal messages do not have any of the required additional information of the claim added to them. Thus their operation is not relevant to the claims.

The col. 5 citation references information added to explorer manages and describes the special routing operations for explorer messages. These are the operations for explorer messages, not the normal messages of the col. 3 citations and thus the citations are not properly combined. Normal and explorer messages are not equivalent and operations applied to explorer messages cannot be transferred to normal messages. Referencing Perlman:

While the above describes the typical mechanism for routing packets in a LAN/bridge network, it does not explain how the routes are determined. This is typically accomplished by means of “explorer” messages. (col. 5, lines 29-32)

Through a procedure described below, copies of the explorer message are propagated through all of the bridges and LANs in the network, exploring every possible route through the network.... (Col. 5, lines 36-39)

Explorer messages are subject to a special procedure when received by bridges. (col. 5, lines 55-56)

... and then forwards 132 the modified version to all connected LANs (except the LAN from which the packet was received). (col. 5, lines 62-65)

Thus Perlman itself makes it very explicit that explorer messages do not use normal routing rules. The claims specifically require using normal routing rules on the frames which include the added information, which are not the messages of col. 3, lines 31-33 but are the explorer messages of col. 5, lines 56-65. Perlman explicitly says explorer frames use special procedures. How “normal” frames as in col. 3, lines 31-33 are routed is not the subject of the claims, so the entire argument advanced in the Office Action is not relevant to the claims.

Summarizing these arguments, normal messages do use normal routing rules but do not have information added in transit. Explorer messages have information added in transit but follow special routing rules just for explorer messages. Perlman does not suggest any amalgamation of the two messages types as they have very different purposes. Adding information to normal messages would only result in producing garbled messages, as the intent is to provide the included payload from point A to point B. Adding information to the payload makes little sense as that would be adding data. Explorer messages are to have the additional information added in transit, but routing the explorer messages using normal rules in Perlman which actually result in the complete failure of the explorer message. The purpose of the explorer message is to find a route because one is not known. As normal routing rules require knowing the route, by definition an explorer message then could not reach its intended destination. Using the explorer message routing rules for normal messages would result in a flood of traffic in the network, probably a totally overwhelming flood. Thus one would not and cannot mix and match normal and explorer messages as apparently being done in the Office Action.

Applicant submits that claims 11, 29, 47 and 65 are allowable.

3. Claims 12, 30, 48 and 66

Claims 12, 30, 48 and 66 require the frames to include source routing information and that the ports transmit them based on the source routing information. The Office Action cites col. 3, lines 31-33 and 54-55 and col. 5, lines 56-64 in rejecting the claims. Applicant traverses the rejection. The first cited portions relate to ordinary or normal messages. Those normal messages do not have any of the required additional information of the claim added to them. Thus their operation is not relevant to the claims. Further, they do not relate to the explorer messages discussed at col. 5, lines 29 to col. 6, line 8. Perlman, at col. 5, lines 63-65, specifically notes that the modified explorer message is forwarded to all connected LANs, except the source LAN. Thus Perlman indicates that explorer messages use very special routing rules, not the source routing required by the claims.

Again the Office Action appears to combine message types that Perlman specifically indicates are different types and behave differently.

Applicant submits that claims 12, 30, 48 and 66 are allowable.

4. Claims 13, 31, 49 and 67

Claims 13, 31, 49 and 67 require using normal routing rules if the source routing information does not indicate a directly connected device. The Office Action cites col. 3, lines 38-40 about the end system reading the message. Applicant does not understand how this citation relates to the claims. It does not involve routing at all. Further, as with claims 11 and 12, it is to a portion for normal messages, not explorer messages and therefore is further unrelated.

The Office Action also apparently references col. 5, lines 64-65 of Perlman. As mentioned above, this section just explains the special routing rules for explorer frames. But these rules are not relevant to the claim because the claims are dependent on claims which specify the use of source routing, which is never used by explorer frames.

Further, as also discussed above, it is improper to mix and match attributes of normal messages and explorer messages as Perlman teaches they are distinct and separate message types.

Applicant submits claims 13, 31, 49 and 67 are allowable.

B. Section 103 Rejection Perlman in view of Shah and Fredericks

1. Claims 14, 32, 50 and 68

Claims 14, 32, 50 and 68 require the frame to be destination addressed to a well known address and the fabric manager to retrieve the true destination address from the payload. The Office Action combines Perlman and Fredericks to form the rejection. Applicant traverses the rejection.

Applicant first notes that the Perlman explorer messages are specifically addressed to the desired end point. To change them to being addressed to a well known address is not taught or suggested by Perlman and would completely destroy the fundamental operation of the Perlman explorer message. This is clearly a hindsight combination and goes against the teachings of the reference.

Perlman is a series of ring networks connected by bridges and routed using source routing. The Fibre Channel switch of Fredericks has no rings and does not use source routing but rather routes using FSPF based on the destination address. The references employ totally different techniques, sufficiently different that Applicant submits that the only place the Office Action could have looked to gain the required knowledge is Applicant's own disclosure, which has been previously admitted is improper. Applicant requests some positive teaching in the references that teaches such a drastic redesign of each reference.

Fredericks relates to Fibre Channel RNID ELS messages. Referencing col. 6, lines 21-34, the addressing of the message is described. It states the message is preferably sent to the nearest neighbor node, though it also notes that any node can be addressed. The fabric controller well known address is only used if the nearest neighbor node is a fabric node, a special instance. Otherwise the message is addressed directly to the other node. Fredericks does not mention anything about retrieving the true destination address from the frame payload, and would not, as the frame is addressed to the relevant item. The Office Action appears to equate the command code in the RNID ELS to the required true destination address, but that equivalence is simply incorrect when the meaning of true destination address is construed properly.

Applicant submits the rejection is improper and that the claims are allowable.

C. Section 103 Rejection Perlman in view of Shah and Lee

1. Claims 15, 33, 51 and 69

Claims 15, 33, 51 and 69 require there to be equal cost routes and the frame is transmitted over all such routes. The Office Action brings in Lee to reject the claims. Applicant traverses the rejection. While Lee may mention the existence of equal cost routes, it does not teach or suggest sending the frame over all of them as required in the claims. Specifically, as quoted in the Office Action Lee teaches to “partially use a number of shortest paths having the same cost.” This is not the required all. This additional congestion is also opposite the stated reason for combination of the references. The cited portion of Lee is related to routing a frame around bottlenecks, so replicating the frame across all of the routes is actually opposed to Lee as that would teach adding many more frames to a congested network.

Applicant submits the rejection is improper and the claims are allowable.

D. CONCLUSION

For reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections should be reversed.

If any fees are inadvertently omitted or if any additional fees are required or have been overpaid, please appropriately charge or credit those fees to Wong, Cabello, Lutsch, Rutherford & Brucculeri, LLP Deposit Account Number 501922, referencing attorney docket number 112-0139US.

Respectfully submitted,

/Keith Lutsch/

September 29, 2008

Filed Electronically

Keith Lutsch, Reg. No. 31,851
Wong, Cabello, Lutsch,
Rutherford & Brucculeri, L.L.P.
20333 SH 249, Suite 600
Houston, TX 77070
832-446-2405

VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. (Previously Presented) A switch for use in a fabric, the switch comprising:
a plurality of ports configured to receive and transmit a frame;
a fabric manager coupled to the plurality of ports to obtain the received frame and to provide a frame to be transmitted, the fabric manager configured to add information; and
a plurality of interconnected switching units coupled to the plurality of ports so that a frame may traverse multiple switching units in the switch,
wherein the fabric manager is configured to add information to the frame, the information including receive and transmit port identity, the switch identity and information about each of the plurality of switching units and interconnections when a frame traverses multiple switching units and to provide the frame for transmission.

2. (Original) The switch of claim 1, the information further including the speed of the port receiving the frame and the link cost of a link connected to the transmit port.

3. (Original) The switch of claim 1, the information further including transmit and receive rates of the port receiving the frame and the port transmitting the frame.

4. (Original) The switch of claim 3, wherein the transmit and receive rates are based on a first defined period.

5. (Original) The switch of claim 4, the information further including transmit and receive rates of the port receiving the frame and the port transmitting the frame based on a second defined period, the second defined period being greater than the first defined period.

6. (Previously Presented) The switch of claim 5, the information further including the number of frames transmitted and received by the port receiving the frame and the port transmitting the frame.

7. (Previously Presented) The switch of claim 4, the information further including the number of frames transmitted and received by the port receiving the frame and the port transmitting the frame.

8. (Original) The switch of claim 1, wherein the frame has an original source and an original destination and wherein the fabric manager is configured to add the information to the frame when the frame is traveling from the original source to the original destination.

9. (Original) The switch of claim 8, wherein the fabric manager is configured to add the information to the frame when the frame is traveling from the original destination to the original source.

10. (Original) The switch of claim 1, wherein a node device is connected to one of the plurality of ports and wherein the fabric manager is configured to transmit the frame to the node device.

11. (Original) The switch of claim 1, wherein the fabric manager is configured to select the port to transmit the frame based on normal routing rules.

12. (Original) The switch of claim 11, wherein the frame contains source routing information and wherein the fabric manager is configured to select the port to transmit the frame based on the source routing information.

13. (Original) The switch of claim 12, wherein the fabric manager is configured to use normal routing rules if the source routing information does not indicate a device directly connected to the switch.

14. (Previously Presented) The switch of claim 11, wherein the switch is a Fibre Channel switch, wherein the frame is destination addressed to a well known address, and

wherein the fabric manager is configured to determine a true destination address by retrieving data from the frame payload.

15. (Original) The switch of claim 1, wherein there are a plurality of equal cost routes that can be used for transmitting the frame and wherein the fabric manager is configured to transmit the frame over all of such routes.

16. (Original) The switch of claim 1, wherein the switch is a Fibre Channel switch and the frame is an extended link services frame.

17. (Original) The switch of claim 1, wherein the fabric manager is configured to determine if the switch is the original destination of the frame, and if so, modify the frame to cause it to return to the original source.

18. (Original) The switch of claim 1, wherein the fabric manager is configured to determine if the switch was the original source of the frame, and if so, to capture the frame and not further transmit the frame.

19. (Original) A fabric comprising:
a first switch; and
a second switch coupled to the first switch,
wherein each of the first and second switches includes:
a plurality of ports configured to receive and transmit a frame; and
a fabric manager coupled to the plurality of ports to obtain the received frame and to provide a frame to be transmitted, the fabric manager configured to add information to the frame, the information including receive and transmit port identity and the switch identity, and to provide the frame for transmission, and
wherein at least one of the first and second switches further includes:
a plurality of interconnected switching units coupled to the plurality of ports so that a frame may traverse multiple switching units in the switch,

wherein the fabric manager of the switch is configured to add information about each of the plurality of switching units and interconnections when a frame traverses multiple switching units.

20. (Original) The fabric of claim 19, the information further including the speed of the port receiving the frame and the link cost of a link connected to the port.

21. (Previously Presented) The fabric of claim 19, the information further including transmit and receive rates of the port receiving the frame and the port transmitting the frame.

22. (Original) The fabric of claim 21, wherein the transmit and receive rates are based on a first defined period.

23. (Original) The fabric of claim 22, the information further including transmit and receive rates of the port receiving the frame and the port transmitting the frame based on a second defined period, the second defined period being greater than the first defined period.

24. (Previously Presented) The fabric of claim 23, the information further including the number of frames transmitted and received by the port receiving the frame and the port transmitting the frame.

25. (Previously Presented) The fabric of claim 22, the information further including the number of frames transmitted and received by the port receiving the frame and the port transmitting the frame.

26. (Original) The fabric of claim 19, wherein the frame has an original source and an original destination and wherein the fabric manager is configured to add the information to the frame when the frame is traveling from the original source to the original destination.

27. (Original) The fabric of claim 26, wherein the fabric manager is configured to add the information to the frame when the frame is traveling from the original destination to the original source.

28. (Original) The fabric of claim 19, wherein a node device is connected to one of the plurality of ports of the first or the second switch and wherein the fabric manager of the respective switch is configured to transmit the frame to the node device.

29. (Original) The fabric of claim 19, wherein the fabric manager is configured to select the port to transmit the frame based on normal routing rules.

30. (Original) The fabric of claim 29, wherein the frame contains source routing information and wherein the fabric manager is configured to select the port to transmit the frame based on the source routing information.

31. (Original) The fabric of claim 30, wherein the fabric manager is configured to use normal routing rules if the source routing information does not indicate a device directly connected to the switch.

32. (Previously Presented) The fabric of claim 29, wherein each switch is a Fibre Channel switch, wherein the frame is destination addressed to a well known address, and wherein the fabric manager is configured to determine a true destination address by retrieving data from the frame payload.

33. (Original) The fabric of claim 19, wherein there are a plurality of equal cost routes that can be used for transmitting the frame and wherein the fabric manager is configured to transmit the frame over all of such routes.

34. (Original) The fabric of claim 19, wherein each switch is a Fibre Channel switch and the frame is an extended link services frame.

35. (Original) The fabric of claim 19, wherein the fabric manager is configured to determine if the switch is the original destination of the frame, and if so, modify the frame to cause it to return to the original source.

36. (Original) The fabric of claim 19, wherein the fabric manager is configured to determine if the switch was the original source of the frame, and if so, to capture the frame and not further transmit the frame.

37. (Original) A network comprising:
a first node device;
a second node device; and
a fabric connected to the first and second node devices,
wherein the fabric includes:
a first switch; and
a second switch coupled to the first switch,
wherein each of the first and second switches includes:
a plurality of ports configured to receive and transmit a frame; and
a fabric manager coupled to the plurality of ports to obtain the received frame and to provide a frame to be transmitted, the fabric manager configured to add information to the frame, the information including receive and transmit port identity and the switch identity, and to provide the frame for transmission, and
wherein at least one of the first and second switches further includes:
a plurality of interconnected switching units coupled to the plurality of ports so that a frame may traverse multiple switching units in the switch,
wherein the fabric manager of the switch is configured to add information about each of the plurality of switching units and interconnections when a frame traverses multiple switching units.

38. (Original) The network of claim 37, the information further including the speed of the port receiving the frame and the link cost of a link connected to the port.

39. (Original) The network of claim 37, the information further including transmit and receive rates of the port receiving the frame and the port transmitting the frame.

40. (Original) The network of claim 39, wherein the transmit and receive rates are based on a first defined period.

41. (Original) The network of claim 40, the information further including transmit and receive rates of the port receiving the frame and the port transmitting the frame based on a second defined period, the second defined period being greater than the first defined period.

42. (Previously Presented) The network of claim 41, the information further including the number of frames transmitted and received by the port receiving the frame and the port transmitting the frame.

43. (Previously Presented) The network of claim 40, the information further including the number of frames transmitted and received by the port receiving the frame and the port transmitting the frame.

44. (Original) The network of claim 37, wherein the frame has an original source and an original destination and wherein the fabric manager is configured to add the information to the frame when the frame is traveling from the original source to the original destination.

45. (Original) The network of claim 44, wherein the fabric manager is configured to add the information to the frame when the frame is traveling from the original destination to the original source.

46. (Original) The network of claim 37, wherein a node device is connected to one of the plurality of ports of the first or the second switch and wherein the fabric manager of the respective switch is configured to transmit the frame to the node device.

47. (Original) The network of claim 37, wherein the fabric manager is configured to select the port to transmit the frame based on normal routing rules.

48. (Original) The network of claim 47, wherein the frame contains source routing information and wherein the fabric manager is configured to select the port to transmit the frame based on the source routing information.

49. (Original) The network of claim 48, wherein the fabric manager is configured to use normal routing rules if the source routing information does not indicate a device directly connected to the switch.

50. (Previously Presented) The network of claim 47, wherein each switch is a Fibre Channel switch, wherein the frame is destination addressed to a well known address, and wherein the fabric manager is configured to determine a true destination address by retrieving data from the frame payload.

51. (Original) The network of claim 37, wherein there are a plurality of equal cost routes that can be used for transmitting the frame and wherein the fabric manager is configured to transmit the frame over all of such routes.

52. (Original) The network of claim 37, wherein each switch is a Fibre Channel switch and the frame is an extended link services frame.

53. (Original) The network of claim 37, wherein the fabric manager is configured to determine if the switch is the original destination of the frame, and if so, modify the frame to cause it to return to the original source.

54. (Original) The network of claim 37, wherein the fabric manager is configured to determine if the switch was the original source of the frame, and if so, to capture the frame and not further transmit the frame.

55. (Previously Presented) A method of providing frame routing information through a switch having a plurality of ports and a plurality of interconnected switching units coupled to the plurality of ports so that a frame may traverse multiple switching units in the switch, the method comprising:

receiving a frame;

adding information to the frame, the information including receive and transmit port identity, the switch identity and information about each of the plurality of switching units and interconnections when a frame traverses multiple switching units; and

providing the frame to a port for transmission.

56. (Original) The method of claim 55, the information further including the speed of the port receiving the frame and the link cost of a link connected to the port.

57. (Original) The method of claim 55, the information further including transmit and receive rates of the port receiving the frame and the port transmitting the frame.

58. (Original) The method of claim 57, wherein the transmit and receive rates are based on a first defined period.

59. (Original) The method of claim 58, the information further including transmit and receive rates of the port receiving the frame and the port transmitting the frame based on a second defined period, the second defined period being greater than the first defined period.

60. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 59, the information further including the number of frames transmitted and received by the port receiving the frame and the port transmitting the frame.

61. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 58, the information further including the number of frames transmitted and received by the port receiving the frame and the port transmitting the frame.

62. (Original) The method of claim 55, wherein the frame has an original source and an original destination and the information is added to the frame when the frame is traveling from the original source to the original destination.

63. (Original) The method of claim 62, wherein the information is added to the frame when the frame is traveling from the original destination to the original source.

64. (Original) The method of claim 55, wherein a node device is connected to one of the plurality of ports and wherein the frame is provided for transmission to the node device.

65. (Original) The method of claim 55, wherein the port selected to transmit the frame is based on normal routing rules.

66. (Original) The method of claim 65, wherein the frame contains source routing information and wherein the port selected to transmit the frame is based on the source routing information.

67. (Original) The method of claim 66, wherein normal routing rules are used if the source routing information does not indicate a device directly connected to the switch.

68. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 65, wherein the switch is a Fibre Channel switch, wherein the frame is destination addressed to a well known address, and wherein a true destination address is determined by retrieving data from the frame payload.

69. (Original) The method of claim 55, wherein there are a plurality of equal cost routes that can be used for transmitting the frame and wherein the frame is transmitted over all of such routes.

70. (Original) The method of claim 55, wherein the switch is a Fibre Channel switch and the frame is an extended link services frame.

71. (Original) The method of claim 55, further comprising:
determining if the switch is the original destination of the frame, and if so, modifying the frame to cause it to return to the original source.

72. (Original) The method of claim 55, further comprising:
determining if the switch was the original source of the frame, and if so, to capturing the frame and not further transmitting the frame.

IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None.

X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None.